AMERICA'S CAPITULATION IN THE WAR ON TERROR

by

Lieutenant Colonel Jonathan L. Pirkey
United States Marine Corps

Professor Glenn K. Cunningham
Project Adviser

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

Report Documentation Page

1. REPORT DATE **15 MAR 2006**	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED **00-00-2005 to 00-00-2006**

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE **America's Capitulation in the War on Terror**	5a. CONTRACT NUMBER
	5b. GRANT NUMBER
	5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER

6. AUTHOR(S) **Jonathan Pirkey**	5d. PROJECT NUMBER
	5e. TASK NUMBER
	5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) **U.S. Army War College,Carlisle Barracks,Carlisle,PA,17013-5050**	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
	11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT
See attached.

15. SUBJECT TERMS

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES **20**	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT **unclassified**	b. ABSTRACT **unclassified**	c. THIS PAGE **unclassified**			

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Lieutenant Colonel Jonathan L. Pirkey

TITLE: America's Capitulation in the War on Terror

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 15 March 2006   WORD COUNT: 5381   PAGES: 20

KEY TERMS: War on Terrorism; Political Will; Insurgency; Press Coverage; Polls

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

This article will describe the goals of the United States in regard to its post September 11,
2001 war on terrorism. It will focus on the objectives in the battle for Iraq and the will of the
American Congress and people to achieve those objectives. It will then examine how even
when those original goals were met, the United States did not achieve all of the results
promised. A study into some ways that the American people are being negatively influenced by
Members of Congress and the press will follow. In summary, the paper will look at how this
negative view of the American people to the battle in Iraq will determine whether the United
States should set a timeline for withdrawal from Iraq.

AMERICA'S CAPITULATION IN THE WAR ON TERROR

The United States of America will enter the fourth year of its battle in the Iraqi theater of operations on March 19, 2006. Given the title "Operation Iraqi Freedom," to date it is the largest theater of operations in what the United States has characterized as a global war on terror.

Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), which began on October 7, 2001, was the United States' first response to the attacks of September 11, 2001. Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) marked the opening of the second overseas battlefield in this global war on terror and the third battlefield overall.[1] The battle for Iraq began, as many do, after many months and even years of war, negotiations, sanctions, and threats.[2] As discussed below, when the first shots were fired on March 19, 2003, the majority of the nation and Congress were behind the President on the decision to invade Iraq and overthrow Saddam Hussein's regime.

The success of the invasion of Afghanistan and the quick overthrow of the Taliban so soon after the attacks of September 11, 2001, had set the stage for an invasion of Iraq. The American public seemed to understand that the battles ahead were extraordinarily important to the safety and security of the United States and the world. America had to be successful in the war on terror because to do nothing or to lose would enable the terrorists to attack the United States again and again if they so chose. With each victory, the United States would continue to set the conditions for democracy to grow in the Middle East, bringing with it enhanced freedom and human rights. Victory in Iraq would be a continuation of a trend that began in Afghanistan which would pervade the rest of the Arab and Muslim world and carry on America's endeavors to make the world a safer place.

Failure was not an option that many truly believed was possible. The United States, the world's only true superpower, had the military might and economic wherewithal to destroy Saddam Hussein's military and effect a regime change. America could not stand by and therefore diminish its legitimacy as a world leader. The outcome of this global war and the battle for Iraq would have enormous implications on world order for decades to come.

Yet now the majority of Americans believe, in retrospect, that President George Bush was wrong to invade Iraq.[3] It seems that almost all of the Democrats in Congress oppose the operation and are calling for withdrawal, and most of the industrialized countries of the world are doing nothing to support the stabilization and reconstruction efforts there. Why did things change so rapidly?

This article will delve into the question of why have the American people, Members of Congress, and the press decided that the issues of stability and democracy in Iraq are not

critical to the overall defeat of radical Islamic extremists and should America then capitulate in Iraq.

President George W. Bush labeled the overall conflict as a war on terror in his address before a joint session of Congress on September 20, 2001. This speech, given soon after the attacks of September 11th, was meant to reassure the American people that the United States government was in control and was ready to respond to whoever had attacked us.[4] It was not long before the phrase "Global War on Terror" (GWOT) became commonplace.

Time and events have shown that the United States is not fighting a global war on terror as it is not engaging every terrorist group and does not deem all terrorists groups to be a threat to its national security. The main effort in this war is and should be defined as the fight against radical Islamic extremism.[5] This term more precisely defines who the true enemy of the United States is at this time. The Bush administration has recently begun defining the goal of the war and who the enemy is along these lines.[6]

This extremism is most often, but not always, associated with Usama bin Laden, Al Qaeda, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, and those Muslims who are using Islam as the basis for their extremism. Al-Qaeda has made no secret of its desire to re-establish the caliphate as a centralized political leadership over the entire Muslim world.

The Al-Qaeda Training Manual makes it very clear that Al Qaeda believes that Islam's grievances with the Western world began with the fall of the caliphate. "After the fall of our orthodox caliphates on March 3, 1924, and after expelling the colonialists, our Islamic nation was afflicted with apostate rulers who took over in the Moslem nation. These rulers turned out to be more infidel and criminal than the colonialists themselves. Moslems have endured all kinds of harm, oppression, and torture at their hands."[7]

The reestablishment of this caliphate which at its height, stretched from Spain to Saharan Africa to Indonesia and including all of the Middle East and most of India, is just the beginning.[8] Their intent does not seem to end with the reestablishment of the caliphate. There is every indication to believe that the total domination of the planet under a Muslim flag, however far-fetched it may seem, is the intent of these extremists.[9]

With regard to Iraq, President Bush's pre-war objective was the total overthrow of Saddam Hussein's government, what has become commonly known as "regime change."[10] It was widely believed by most countries that Saddam Hussein and Iraq was supporting international terrorism and was producing (and of course possessed) weapons of mass destruction/effects.[11] Stating that "Members of Congress of both political parties, and members of the United Nations Security Council, agree that Saddam Hussein is a threat to peace and must disarm. …"[12]

President Bush went on to state that "…we have every reason to assume the worst, (use of weapons of mass destruction/effects (WMD/E) by Hussein) and we have an urgent duty to prevent the worst from occurring."[13]

President Bush had previously addressed the United Nations General Assembly in September of 2002. In this address, he stated that the "United States has no quarrel with the Iraqi people; they've suffered too long in silent captivity," and outlined the numerous abuses of Saddam Hussein's government in Iraq.[14] These abuses included numerous violations of United Nations (U.N.) Security Council Resolution 1373 with its continuous support of terrorism, WMD/E production and use, and the ongoing denial of access to weapons inspectors. President Bush also accused Iraq of siphoning off money "oil for food" program "to build lavish palaces for himself, and to buy arms for his country." President Bush put forward a list of conditions that the Iraqi regime must fulfill to ensure peace and not bring on an invasion.[15]

There was much national and international debate over whether Iraq was connected to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, whether Iraq had and/or was producing WMD/E, and whether the time had finally come to enforce those U.N. Security Council resolutions by invading Iraq and enacting regime change forcibly.

On February 5, 2003, as the United States was building up its forces in Kuwait and elsewhere in the Middle East, Secretary of State Colin Powell addressed a the U.N. Security Council. Stating that he was there to address two issues: "First, to support the core assessments…." that "Iraq appears not to have come to a genuine acceptance, not even today, of the disarmament which was demanded of it," and "…to provide you with additional information, to share with you what the United States knows about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction as well as Iraq's involvement in terrorism, which is also the subject of Resolution 1441 and other earlier resolutions."[16]

In this address, Mr. Powell gave many examples how Iraq was not living up to its obligations under U. N. Security Council resolutions and that the Security Council must not shirk its responsibilities to enforce those resolutions. He ended his address by stating that the U. N. Security Council has "…an obligation to our citizens, we have an obligation to this body to see that our resolutions are complied with. We wrote 1441 not in order to go to war, we wrote 1441 to try to preserve the peace. We wrote 1441 to give Iraq one last chance. Iraq is not so far taking that one last chance. We must not shrink from whatever is ahead of us. We must not fail in our duty and our responsibility to the citizens of the countries that are represented by this body."[17]

Despite Mr. Powell's arguments that it was time to force Iraq into compliance, the United States could not get enough votes in the Security Council for authorization to go to war. This, along with France's threatened veto, caused the United States to withdraw its proposed resolution. The weeks of intense diplomacy and pressure from the Bush administration that followed, failed to convince a majority of the Security Council's fifteen members that the time for war against Iraq had come.

The United States formed a coalition of the willing, and on March 19, 2003, invaded Iraq. It was not long until the Iraqi military was defeated and Saddam Hussein's regime toppled.

The invasion of Iraq went very well from a military standpoint. There were relatively few casualties for the size and scope of the battle. There were a number of firsts for the United States military: the United States Marine Corps conducted offensive operations the farthest from the ocean in its history, the military as a whole used fewer forces for the size of the operation than it had ever done in the past. There was a sense of optimism in the United States that good things were being accomplished in Iraq.

The President Bush flew to the aircraft carrier USS Abraham Lincoln in May of 2003 to congratulate the crew of that ship, which had just returned from the Middle East after participating in OIF. President Bush's address was meant for more than the crew of that ship or even the rest of the military. It was meant for the United States and the international community. With a huge banner that read, "Mission Accomplished" behind him, the President jubilantly assessed the mission in Iraq to that date. Granting that his audience was the crew of the ship, their response was still tremendous. They knew they had done a great job and were proud of it.

Seemingly lost in the moment were the words of his speech. The President let the world know that day that he considered that the, "transition from dictatorship to democracy will take time, but it is worth every effort. Our coalition will stay until our work is done and then we will leave and we will leave behind a free Iraq. The battle of Iraq is one victory in a war on terror that began on September the 11th, 2001 and still goes on. … The war on terror is not over, yet it is not endless. We do not know the day of final victory, but we have seen the turning of the tide."[18]

Although the President may not have believed the battle in Iraq would continue as long as it has, the warning of a potentially long war went out on that day. Those words were prophetic, probably much more than intended. However, most of the world did not pay any attention to the actual words as they were more caught up in the moment. That speech set the course from

which the President has continually followed to the present, making only slight corrections in response to the public's attitude changes about the battle in Iraq.

It was not much later in the year when, as the ability of the insurgency to create havoc became very clear, members of Congress and the press began to speak out against the President and the course of the battle in Iraq. At first, the dissention came from those people who were either against opening a theater of operations in Iraq from the beginning, were for it as long as it was going to be a swift operation, or found that it served some personal political purpose to now oppose the operations in Iraq. Most of these people are calling for an immediate end to those operations, even though the effect on America's world standing and security would be in jeopardy.

However, after these initial protests to the course of the battle in Iraq, the momentum within the public at large to find fault with any aspect of the continuing battle grew. There was no quick exit from Iraq, as there had been from Kuwait after Desert Storm, and Soldiers and Marines continued to be killed. Additionally, billions of dollars of national treasure were being spent in Iraq as the deficit continued to grow.

The failure to find large quantities of weapons of mass destruction/ effect in Iraq cast a shadow on the legitimacy of the invasion. Soon, many people began to question if the President truly had a plan for victory in Iraq. Then, in the summer of 2005, Hurricane Katrina laid devastation to the Gulf Coast of the United States. The hurricane caused billions of dollars of damage and severely affected the lives of hundreds of thousands of the residents of that area. There were allegations that the federal government did not respond to the emergency as quickly as it should have and that this poor response was a result of America and her military being so consumed by the battle in Iraq.

The question of whether to stay or leave Iraq is monumental. It has major international, regional and national strategic implications. Many people believe that it would be a signal to the world, and more importantly, to the extremists, that the United States is not committed to the war against radical Islamic extremists.

Capitulation and withdrawal from Iraq could bring about three main effects: Firstly, it would embolden the extremists who have stated for years that the United States does not have the national willpower to enter into a protracted war; Secondly, it would justify the actions of that part of the world community which has taken little or no action to support the United States; and Thirdly and most importantly, it would lengthen the war on terror considerably as there is little doubt that the extremists will not be satiated in their victory in Iraq but will gain support and will continue their fight to secure more of what was the caliphate of old.

An overriding theme of those who are calling for the pullout is that the United States cannot win militarily in the Iraqi theater and therefore there is no hope for a victory. This feeling of hopelessness is not being based on any quantifiable data that they have put forward. It seems to be based partly on our perpetual desire to equate every military campaign to Vietnam and partly on the Democrats intense dislike of President George W. Bush and their desire to take control of the Congress and win the Presidency. Either way, hopelessness has become the primary course of action for this country lately. If something is too hard or takes too long or more importantly, will cost money and the lives of Americans, it quickly becomes a hopeless endeavor that should be ended as soon as possible.

However, this nation's treatment of the issue of withdrawal in the same manner as any other simple political argument between the Republicans and the Democrats is troubling. There does not seem to exist in this country even the smallest shadow of a wartime mentality. With regard to international relations, the United States has, since the end of World War II, trended to a "guns and butter" mentality with regard to pursuing war.[19] As long as the public believes the economy at home is not being negatively affected, then all is well. The guns and butter mentality has been a significant planning strategy since the end of wartime rationing after World War Two and came to prominence during the Vietnam War. Of course, this line of thinking continues only until the first casualties start occurring or until a member of the minority party or a candidate for office starts campaigning against the incumbent.

Almost all of the critics of the battle for Iraq are using the statistics on the number of casualties, dead and wounded, of the service members serving in OIF as a prime reason for why the policy and plans or lack thereof, are failed. There are those in the United States Congress who have become very vocal in calling for the United States to immediately start pulling troops out of Iraq.[20]

These members of Congress are almost all Democrats and, with few exceptions, voted against the resolution authorizing the President to go to war in Iraq.[21] The current trend by this group has been to point to those members of Congress who are veterans and are opposing the operations in Iraq as experts in the current operations. They are singled out by those who either share their points of view or are using them for their own agendas. This seems to be due to the idea that these veterans should instinctually know whether a war is going well or poorly because they are war veterans. Holding the opinions of a veteran of a different war to a higher level is a fundamental mistake. This remark is in no way meant to demean or diminish the veteran's service to their country. However, the experiences of a politician who served in the military or

6

was actually in combat thirty or more years ago do not make that politician an expert on a war being fought today.

Indeed, once a politician wraps himself in that service and states that another politician was not there or didn't wear a uniform and therefore does not have the ability to lead during war, they have lost the credibility that that service has given them. Pennsylvania Congressman Murtha's stated, in reference to Vice President Dick Cheney, "I like guys who got five deferments and never been there, and send people to war, and then don't like to hear suggestions about what need to be done."[22] Senator John Kerry, a Democrat from Massachusetts, stated on the Senate floor "It frankly disgusts me that a bunch of guys who never chose to put on the uniform of their country now choose in the most personal way, in the most venomous way to question the character of a man who did wear the uniform of his country and who bled doing it."[23] Franklin D. Roosevelt never wore a military uniform nor served in combat yet he is credited with being a very gifted wartime leader.

Congressman Murtha's website states that the average number of deaths of U. S. service members has grown from 1 to 4 a day since the Abu Ghraib prison scandal.[24] Another of his press releases states that "Over 15,500 have been seriously injured…"[25] The publishing of these figures without proper perspective or meaning is, to a large part, negatively influencing the American public with regard to operations is Iraq. The reason for their use is very clear. These numbers conjure up extremely potent visceral mental images for Americans of either a funeral or a grievously wounded service member. Congressman John Murtha stated in his proposed joint resolution for our troops to be "redeployed (from Iraq) at the earliest practicable date" that as of the date of the drafting of his resolution, "2,079 U. S. troops have been killed in Operation Iraqi Freedom."[26]

The immediate problem with the data that Congressman Murtha is using is that they are incorrect. His data on the average daily number of deaths has no basis in fact. The only months in which coalition deaths (including combat and non-combat of the U. S. and U. K.) averaged four or higher per day were March 2003, April 2004, November 2004, and January, 2005. Almost all other months were significantly lower.[27] The average daily number of U. S. combat deaths during OIF is 1.67 and that average has remained fairly steady since what was originally called the end of major combat operations in May of 2003.

Indeed, the numbers of dead and wounded are increasing daily. This is an unfortunate fact in any combat operation. As of November 30, 2005, there have been 15,881 military wounded in action and 2,108 military deaths since the start of OIF on March 19, 2003.[28] Of the total deaths, 1,651 were categorized as hostile deaths and 457 were categorized as non-hostile

deaths. Of the 15,881 wounded in action, 8,468 or slightly over 53 percent were returned to duty within seventy two hours.[29]

Admittedly, the only non-serious wounds are those that someone else receives and any type of wound received in action is, in the words of Stephen Crane, "a red badge of courage."[30] However, with that in mind, a wound that allows a service member to return to duty in a combat zone within seventy two hours cannot require more than sutures to close. The author could not find data on the number of service members that were returned to duty without evacuation after the seventy-two hour period.

In startling contrast to the above numbers, are those of active duty, non-combat deaths military wide in 2003 and 2004. There were a total of 1,410 service member deaths in 2003 and 1,150 in 2004. 344 of the 2003 deaths and 737 of the 2004 deaths, for a total of 33 percent, were listed as deaths from hostile action. Of the 3,297 total deaths, 1,328 or 40 percent were classified as resulting from accident, undetermined, or pending results.

There are no easy ways to fight wars. The American public has become accustomed to the almost sterile destruction of the enemy by its aircraft and missiles. Additionally, the United States was very fortunate that in the first Gulf War, Bosnia, and the Balkans there were very few casualties taken. Intertwined with both of these is the never-ending hangover from Vietnam has left the public with no taste for any casualties.

The Bush administration has a policy of no body counts when dealing with the enemy. However, this is a one-sided policy. The listing of American casualties has become a daily part of the media's reporting. When "milestones" of casualty numbers are reached, usually in blocks of five hundred, the media and those who oppose the operations in Iraq, use the occasion to attempt to show that it is proof the operations are failing.

The time has passed where an enemy can so shape the will of the American people that it will capitulate or surrender to that enemy. However, Clausewitz's "remarkable trinity" [31] dealing with relationship among the people, the military, and the government does still apply with regard to how long the American people will allow their government to prosecute a war. Clausewitz warned that each part of the trinity must be taken into effect when determining how and whether the United States can achieve its strategic goals. It is bad policy to ignore any one part of the trinity. [32]

For example, military actions – positive and negative – impact the American people's views of the war, its legitimacy, and whether progress is being made. Military actions also affect the Government's responses and actions, and the peoples' reactions. These all impact on the national will and are constantly interacting among themselves.

The United States has become a nation addicted to twenty-four hours a day news shows. How they perceive an issue is tied to how it is presented in the news. This has led to the press having an increasingly important role in shaping American will with regard to issues before them.

The press' ability to shape opinion in regard to the battle in Iraq is powerful. A roadside bomb's destruction can be seen minutes after it explodes. A Marine shooting a wounded Iraqi in a mosque will be replayed many times. If the story is being shaped to show that the military is failing, the press only has to show a destroyed neighborhood. If the press was even-handed, this would not be an issue as the good would be shown with the bad. However, that does not seem to be the case.

An organization called the Media Research Center researched the news stories of ABC, CBS, and NBC and lists what they believe is statistical evidence showing that these news organizations are predominately showing stories of "assassinations, car bombings, and casualty reports."[33] The report's findings included: "Few stories focused on the heroism or generous actions of American soldiers." "Network coverage has been overwhelmingly pessimistic," and "Even coverage of the Iraqi political process has been negative." This is in spite of the fact that the news organizations had good news they could have reported. The report concluded with the fact that, ". . . TV's profoundly pessimistic coverage has shortchanged the accomplishments of both the U.S. military and Iraq's new leaders and has certainly contributed to the public's growing discontent with the war."[34]

Many of the critics of the Iraqi theater of operations state that there are more Islamic extremists fighting the United States because of the battle in Iraq. The supposition is that if the United States had limited the war against radical Islamic extremists to Afghanistan the number of those bringing arms against her would be fewer. Senator Ted Kennedy of Massachusetts, an opponent of the operations in Iraq from the start has stated that, "But Iraq was not a breeding ground for terrorism. Our invasion has made it one."[35] There does not appear to be any empirical data on this even though the idea has widespread use.

A guest speaker at the U. S. Army War College stated in both his remarks in the open forum and in a follow on meeting with a seminar group that there was empirical data that showed that this number is increasing solely because of the invasion of Iraq. When pressed on the subject, he could not point to actual polls of extremists who stated that they were fighting solely because of the invasion of Iraq. The data appears to be anecdotal or based on intelligence information. The United States and others have long acknowledged that both of

these sources are not very reliable when dealing with the inhabitants of the Middle East or Muslims in general.

If the assumption that Iraq has become either a breeding ground or magnet for extremists and the stated goal of the re-establishment of the caliphate by Al Qaeda and individuals who are sympathetic to their cause is true, the question then must be asked whether this is necessarily a bad situation for the United States.

There does not seem to be much doubt that the extremists are a small but very violent group of Muslims. The same speaker mentioned above put the number at one to two *one-thousandths* of the Muslim population of one billion, two hundred million. The actual percentage is probably higher among the male Muslim population as the majority of the extremists are males. These extremists will move to the fight wherever it is and will not stop fighting until they are killed or the caliphate is secure.

The National Intelligence Council's December 2004 report *"Mapping the Global Future"* stated that "(t)he al-Qa'ida membership that was distinguished by having trained in Afghanistan will gradually dissipate, to be replaced in part by the *dispersion of the experienced survivors of the conflict in Iraq*." (Emphasis added)[36] President George W. Bush, in his speech to the United States Naval Academy on November 30, 2005 stated:

> This is an enemy without conscience -- and they cannot be appeased. If we were not fighting and destroying this enemy in Iraq, they would not be idle. They would be plotting and killing Americans across the world and within our own borders. By fighting these terrorists in Iraq, Americans in uniform are defeating a direct threat to the American people. Against this adversary, there is only one effective response: We will never back down. We will never give in. And we will never accept anything less than complete victory. [37]

This begs the question of where the United States would rather fight the majority of the extremists. The fairly open and accessible Iraq presents itself as a much better alternative to the extremely rugged and almost inaccessible Afghanistan. The idea that if you don't confront your enemy he will simply go away is more of a hope than a reality.

How much of a cost America is willing to pay and the decision on whether that cost is justified, is for the American public to make. At the end of the day, through elections and polling, the American public will make themselves heard. Whether they have a firm understanding of the significant stakes involved will be debated endlessly.

The international community, even those who have been affected by radical Islamic terrorism, has left it to the United States to be the leader in fighting the terrorists. This has allowed those countries that chose to do nothing to sit on the sidelines and not take sides. It has allowed other countries to judge every step or misstep by the United States without having

to actually do anything. Other countries stay on the periphery, helping as they see fit. With few exceptions, none have taken on the challenge of fighting this radical Islamism.

America's involvement in Iraq costs her more in lives and treasure each day. The time may have come for us to say we have tried and cannot do it alone anymore. Americans are not acting and therefore cannot believe that we are involved in a war whose outcome will affect them for generations to come.

When the author began this paper, he was certain that the United States should remain in Iraq for as long as it took to secure that country. However, that viewpoint has changed. I do not believe that the American people, the Iraqi's, or the international community cares enough about the situation there for the United States to continue to spend her treasure and spill her blood in Iraq. It is time for the international community to take responsibility for itself. The nations of the world have become too reliant on the idea that the United States is the reason that radical Islamic extremists exist in this world.

The President should call a joint session of Congress and tell them and the American people that the time has come to leave Iraq. He should then address the General Assembly of the United Nations and tell them the same. A timeline of no more than two years should be given to the international community before the United States pulls out of Iraq completely.

This action is not as bold and audacious as it may seem at first glance. Congressional leaders in the United States have called for just such a timeline for over a year now. This is the "exit strategy" that they have hounded the president for. The international community, which is as dependent on Middle East oil as the United States, will have to put rhetoric aside and replace it with action.

The Iraqi people will no longer be able to view the United States as an occupier of their country and will have to decide which direction they want to go. They can choose to isolate themselves with a totalitarian government or continue down the road to a form of democracy.

Many have cited a part of the "Powell Doctrine" that states that if "you break it, you bought it,"[38] when it comes to United States involvement in another country. In other words, if you occupy a failed state, you are stuck with the difficult, costly, and lengthy task of nation-building. The argument can be made that the United States "broke" Iraq when she invaded in March 2003 to effect the regime change written about above. If you continue with that theme, the question remains as to how many times you have to pay for the same item. America has spent hundreds of billions of dollars and many of her sons and daughters in Iraq after Saddam Hussein was removed from power. The debt has been paid; it's time to move on.

[1] Arguably, the first battle field was the United States itself with the attacks of September 11, 2001.

[2] Many, including United States Air Force veterans, consider that the United States has been at war with Iraq since the beginning of Desert Storm in 1991.

[3] PollingReport.com, Iraq, available from http://www.pollingreport.com/iraq.htm, Internet, accessed 12 February, 2006.

Pew Research Center for the People & the Press survey conducted by Princeton Survey Research Associates International. Feb. 1-5, 2006. N=1,502 adults nationwide. MoE ± 3. RV = registered voters

"Do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling the situation in Iraq?"

	Approve	Disapprove	Unsure
	%	%	%
2/1-5/06	38	57	5
12/7-11/05	36	58	6
10/12-24/05	37	57	6
9/6-7/05	34	58	8
7/13-17/05	35	57	8
5/11-15/05	37	56	7
2/16-21/05	40	53	7
1/5-9/05	45	50	5
10/15-19/04	37	56	7
9/8-13/04	47	45	8
8/5-10/04	43	52	5
7/8-18/04	42	53	5
6/3-13/04	42	51	7
4/21-25/04	44	48	8
4/1-4/04	40	53	7
1/6-11/04	59	37	4
9/17-22/03	52	40	8

"Do you think the U.S. made the right decision or the wrong decision in using military force against Iraq?"

	Right Decision	Wrong Decision	Unsure
	%	%	%
2/1-5/06	51	44	5
1/4-8/06	45	47	8

12/7-11/05	47	48	5
10/6-10/05	44	50	6
9/8-11/05	49	44	7
7/13-17/05	49	44	7
6/8-12/05	47	45	8
2/16-21/05	47	47	6
1/5-9/05	51	44	5
12/1-16/04	49	44	7
10/27-30/04 RV	48	41	11
10/15-19/04	46	42	12
10/1-3/04	50	39	11
9/8-13/04	53	39	8
8/5-10/04	53	41	6
7/8-18/04	52	43	5
6/3-13/04	55	38	7
5/3-9/04	51	42	7
4/21-25/04	54	37	9
4/1-4/04	57	35	8
3/17-21/04	55	39	6
2/24-29/04	60	32	8
2/11-16/04	56	39	5
1/6-11/04	65	30	5
12/19/03 - 1/4/04	62	28	10
12/15-17/03	67	26	7
10/03	60	33	7
9/03	63	31	6
7/14 - 8/5/03	63	30	7
6/20 - 7/2/03	67	24	9
4/10-16/03	74	19	7
4/8-9/03	74	19	7
4/2-7/03	72	20	8
3/28 - 4/1/03	69	25	6
3/25-27/03	74	21	5
3/23-24/03	74	21	5
3/20-22/03	71	22	7

[4] President George W. Bush, "Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People," available from http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html, Internet, accessed 30 November 2005.

[5] Although probably said by others before, I heard it the first time from Lieutenant Colonel Scott McBride, U. S. Army.

[6] President George W. Bush, speech to The National Endowment for Democracy, available from http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/nationalsecurity/, Internet, accessed 03 December, 2005.

[7] "The Al-Qaeda Manual", page UK/BM-7, available from http://www.usdoj.gov/ag/ manualpart1_1.pdf, Internet, accessed, 29 November 2005.

[8] "Map of the history of the Muslims, Empires of Islam," available from http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/~rs143/ map6.jpg, Internet, accessed 3 December 2005.

[9] "What al-Qaida Really Wants", available from http://www.jihadwatch.org/archives/ 007726.php, Internet, accessed 29 November, 2005.

[10] See: *Iraq Liberation* Act *of* 1998*, Statutes at Large* 112, sec. 3178 (1998) and *Authorization for Use of Military Force* Against *Iraq, Statutes at Large, 116, sec. 1498 (2002).*

[11] President George W. Bush, "Iraq, Denial and Deception" President Bush Outlines Iraqi Threat, Remarks by the President on Iraq, 7 October 2002, available from http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/10/20021007-8.html; Internet; accessed 25 January 2006.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

[14] George W. Bush, President United States of the America, "Remarks at the United Nations General Assembly, September 12, 2002, Remarks by the President in Address to the United Nations General Assembly, New York, New York," Office of the Press Secretary, 12 September 2002; available from http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020912-1.html; Internet; accessed 25 January 2006.

[15] Ibid. "If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will immediately and unconditionally forswear, disclose, and remove or destroy all weapons of mass destruction, long-range missiles, and all related material. If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will immediately end all support for terrorism and act to suppress it, as all states are required to do by U.N. Security Council resolutions. If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will cease persecution of its civilian population, including Shi'a, Sunnis, Kurds, Turkomans, and others, again as required by Security Council resolutions. If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will release or account for all Gulf War personnel whose fate is still unknown. It will return the remains of any who are deceased, return stolen property, accept liability for losses resulting from the invasion of Kuwait, and fully cooperate with international efforts to resolve these issues, as required by Security Council resolutions. If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will immediately end all illicit trade outside the oil-for-food program. It will accept U.N. administration of funds from that program, to ensure that the money is used fairly and promptly for the benefit of the Iraqi people. If all these steps are taken, it will signal a new openness and accountability in Iraq. And it could open the prospect of the United Nations helping to build a government that represents all Iraqis -- a government based on respect for human rights, economic liberty, and internationally supervised elections."

[16] Colin Powell, U. S. Secretary of State, "Iraq, Denial and Deception" U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell Addresses the U.N. Security Council, February 5, 2003, available from

14

http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/02/20030205-1.html, Internet; accessed 25 January 2006.

[17] Ibid.

[18]President George W. Bush, Speech, aboard the USS Abraham Lincoln, 1 May 2003, CNN, "Bush makes historic speech aboard warship," CNN, 1 May 2003; available from http://www.cnn.com/2003/US/05/01/bush.transcript/index.html; Internet; accessed 20 January 2006.

[19] "Guns and Butter" envisions an economy that can only produce two products: Guns and Butter (i.e. military goods versus civilian goods). If all the resources this economy could produce 5,000 guns or in the alternative, 50,000 pounds of butter, but could not produce the same amount of both, the leader has to make a choice of what to produce. If the public believes they are getting all the butter they need, they don't care how many guns are being produced.

[20] Congressman John Murtha – Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District – Press Releases, available from http://www.house.gov/apps/list/press/pa12_murtha/statement_051117iraq.html; Internet, accessed 30 November 2005.

[21] Congressman John Murtha and Senator John Kerry both voted for the resolution.

[22] Media Research Center, CyberAlert, available from http://www.mediaresearch.org/cyberalerts/2005/cyb20051121.asp, Internet, accessed 3 December 2005.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Congressman John Murtha, Ibid.

[25] Congressman John Murtha – Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District – Press Releases; available from http://www.house.gov/apps/list/press/pa12_murtha/pr051117iraq.html, Internet, accessed 30 November 2005.

[26] Congressman John Murtha – Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District – Press Releases available from http://www.house.gov/apps/list/press/pa12_murtha/pr_051117_iraqres.html, Internet, accessed 30 November 2005.

[27] Iraq Coalition Casualty Count; available from http://icasualties.org/oif/, Internet, accessed 30 November 2005.

[28] Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) U.S. Casualty Status, November 30, 2005 available from http://www.defenselink.mil/news/casualty.pdf, Internet, accessed 30 November 2005.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Stephen Crane, "The Red Badge of Courage", D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1895.

[31] Clausewitz, *On War*, Michael Howard and Peter Paret, Indexed Edition, (Princeton, NJ; Princeton University Press, 1984), p. 89. "War is more than a true chameleon that slightly adapts its characteristics to the given case. As a total phenomenon its dominant tendencies

always make war a remarkable trinity--composed of primordial violence, hatred, and enmity, which are to be regarded as a blind natural force; of the play of chance and probability within which the creative spirit is free to roam; and of its element of subordination, as an instrument of policy, which makes it subject to reason alone. The first of these three aspects mainly concerns the people; the second the commander and his army; the third the government. The passions that are to be kindled in war must already be inherent in the people; the scope which the play of courage and talent will enjoy in the realm of probability and chance depends on the particular character of the commander and the army; but the political aims are the business of government alone. These three tendencies are like three different codes of law, deep-rooted in their subject and yet variable in their relationship to one another. A theory that ignores any one of them or seeks to fix an arbitrary relationship between them would conflict with reality to such an extent that for this reason alone it would be totally useless. Our task therefore is to develop a theory that maintains a balance between these three tendencies, like an object suspended between three magnets."

[32] Ibid.

[33] Media Research Center, Morbid Networks Tout Iraq War's "Milestone" ABC, CBS and NBC Skip Army Soldier's Heroics; ABC and CBS Downplay Democratic Constitution, Media Research Center, Alexandria, Virginia, October 26, 2005, available from http://www.mrc.org/realitycheck/2005/fax20051026.asp, Internet, accessed 19 January 2006.

[34] Media Research Center, Special Report, *An In-Depth Study, Analysis or Review Exploring the Media TV's Bad News Brigade, ABC, CBS, and NBC's Defeatist Coverage of the War in Iraq.* (Alexandria, Virginia, October 14, 2005), available from http://www.mrc.org/SpecialReports/2005/sum/sum101405.asp; Internet; accessed 19 January 2006.

[35] REMARKS OF SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S FAILURE TO PROVIDE A REALISTIC, SPECIFIC PLAN TO BRING STABILITY TO IRAQ, 16 October, 2003, available from http://kennedy.senate.gov/index_high.html, Internet, accessed 03 December 2005.

[36] National Intelligence Council, "Mapping the Global Future," available from http://www.foia.cia.gov/ 2020/2020.pdf, Internet, accessed 29 November 2005.

[37] President George W. Bush, available from http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/11/20051130-2.html, Internet, accessed 1 December 2005.

[38] "Pottery Barn rule" is the idea that you own what you break. Ironically, it is not the policy of the store "pottery Barn" to make you pay for items you accidentally break. I could not find any quotes from Mr. Powell on this.